

Sector-wide Approaches and Civil Society

Joan S. Atherton
Senior Social Scientist

Prepared for the
Forum on Accountability and Risk Management
Under Program-Based Approaches

Organized by the Canadian International Development Agency's
Learning Network on Program-Based Approaches (LENPA)

Ottawa, Canada
June 19-21, 2002



U.S. Agency for International Development

Sector-wide Approaches and Civil Society

Joan S. Atherton¹
Senior Social Scientist
Bureau for Policy and Program Coordination
United States Agency for International Development

Introduction

This paper discusses the analytical framework for assessing civil society's roles and impacts on sector-wide approaches (SWAs). It then reviews some data from U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) field missions that are participating in SWAs. Analysis of these data suggest that participation of civil society is beneficial and can and should be enhanced. Host country expectations that all sector activities are to be carried out by government, and that all funds will flow through a basket financing mechanism into the host country government's budget presents a major obstacle to increased participation of civil society in SWAs, however.

Analytical Framework

Based on the general literature on SWAs, three general phases were identified at which civil society can participate:

- design
- implementation
- monitoring and evaluation (M&E).

Civil society participation in the **design** of SWAs includes advocacy for or consultation with particular components or target groups even prior to a formal design process, membership in public sector-donor-civil society intensive planning groups or teams, consultation and/or advocacy based on the formal plan.

¹ The analysis presented herein is that of the author and does not constitute an official position of the U.S. Agency for International Development..

Involvement during the **implementation** phase generally takes two forms. The first is participation in a consultative or steering forum that guides implementation. The second is execution of activities (for example, provision of health services or agricultural extension services) that are part of the SWAp plan.

Civil society **monitoring and evaluation** efforts in SWAps can be independent assessments performed by civil society groups, assessments of donor programs that are parts of SWAps, information provision during M&E and/or consultation on the results of M&E.

These activities are illustrative of the roles civil society can play, and derive from experience with participation in SWAps as well as other development mechanisms.

USAID Field Mission Data

Using the analytical framework outlined above, questionnaires were sent to USAID field missions that were identified at headquarters as participants in SWAps in their respective host countries. A list of these SWAps is included as an annex. Headquarters identified 19 SWAps in which USAID is a participant via its resident field missions. Twelve were in the health sector, four in the education sector and three in the agriculture sector. A questionnaire was e-mailed to USAID contact personnel for each of the 19 SWAps. Twelve responses were received: 6 in health, 3 in education and 3 in agriculture. In two of the 12 cases, the author interviewed the contact person using the questionnaire as a guide. All other responses were typewritten and transmitted by e-mail from the field mission contact person.

The working definition for a SWAp that was used in the questionnaire was that it is a strategy in which all significant funding for the sector supports a single sector policy and expenditure program, under government leadership, adopting common approaches across the sector. A SWAp is **SOMETIMES** funded with budget support, but that is not the defining variable. SWAps are often funded by individual donor mechanisms and host country revenues using separate instruments within a common framework.

Of the 12 field missions responding, 75 per cent, or nine (4 health, 2 education and 3 agriculture), reported that civil society had a role during the design phase of the SWAp in which USAID was participating. Sixty-seven per cent, or eight (4 health, 2 education and 3 agriculture), reported that civil society was involved in implementation, and 58 per cent, or seven (2 health, 3 education and 2 agriculture), reported civil society participation in the M&E phase. A

number of the respondents indicated that the SWAp was relatively recent and had not yet reached the M&E phase, which may account for the lower rate of participation. Two indicated that civil society had only recently become involved in implementation, in one instance because implementation had only recently started, so all partners were new to implementation.

The sample size for this survey is small, and thus the results must be interpreted with caution. Given that the SWAps included cover several sectors, and there was no significant difference among the sectors, civil society participation during all phases appears eminently feasible.

Civil Society Roles in SWAps

Design

At the design stage, the data indicate that civil society largely plays an advocacy role. Occasionally, it also plays an instrumental role as a full partner in the design. Examples from the responses illustrate these roles.

Cambodia Sector-Wide Management (SWiM) – Health: MEDICAM is the umbrella coordinating body which represents all the NGOs [both international, national, community-based organizations, including UN agencies and bilateral agencies as observers] in the sector. It is a membership-based organization. In the design phase of the MoH's sector strategy, which is currently underway, MEDICAM sits on the policy dialogue and consultative meetings. Many of the NGOs are represented in the technical working groups such as Service Delivery Working Group, Private Sector Working Group, Quality Improvement Working Group, Institutional Development Working Group etc.

Mali PRODESS - Health:

- Groupe Pivot/Health Population, a consortium of all PVOs/NGOs working in health in Mali, advocated for increased civil society's role in health policy development and strategy implementation.
- FENASCOM (National Federation of CSCOM/community health centers) - represented interests of community centers.

Pan Caribbean Partnership Against HIV/AIDS – Health: Organizations such as People Living with HIV/AIDS and CNC participated in the design. All civil society organizations participating at the design stage were advocacy groups.

Mali Education Sector Investment Program (ESEP/PISE) – Education: Signed in September 2001, ESEP is the sector wide approach to implement the Ten Year Educational Development Program (PRODEC) that was designed through a participatory process including all education stakeholders (communities, local Non Governmental Organizations and Private Voluntary Organizations mainly American). Their input was provided mainly through workshops and focus groups.

Uganda – Education: The Forum for Education NGOs in Uganda (FENU) represented civil society and was consulted during the design of the SWAp.

Zambia Agriculture Sector Investment Program (ASIP) - Agriculture: Yes, mainly the Zambia National Farmers Union (ZNFU) [were involved in the design]. The ZNFU co-chaired, with government, the steering committee for the design of ASIP.

Mozambique Agricultural Sector Development Program (PROAGRI):

- Who: International and national NGOs, especially those already implementing donor funded agricultural sector activities; the university; and private sector companies to a lesser degree.
- How: Civil society was involved mainly through consultations, rather than direct participating in the design. Donors particularly ensured that NGO input was included in the design. The final design incorporates a significant continuing implementation role for NGOs.

Bolivia Sistema Boliviana de Tecnologia Agropecuaria (SIBTA) – Agriculture: SIBTA is a sector-wide approach to improving agriculture in Bolivia. It resulted from a confluence of opinion among those of the donor community, the Government of Bolivia and the private sector. That confluence of opinion recognized that the mechanisms for assisting farmers and supporting agricultural development was not working. The creation of SIBTA was a three-way participation among the GOB, the donors and the private sector. It involved four foundations, based on macro-ecological regions of Bolivia... These foundations were established as private entities with a peculiar twist. Their Boards of Directors are comprised of a combination of private (60%) and public (40%) sector representatives. . . . The second peculiarity is that these private foundations are authorized to manage public funds.

Implementation

In respect to implementation, the responses from USAID's field missions showed that civil society plays two roles: advocacy and operations.

Zambia – Health: At the national level, the civil society partner with the most institutionalized and visible role is a local NGO, the Churches Health Association of Zambia. This umbrella organization provides a significant proportion of the health services in the rural areas through their member institutions. They receive government funds and staff and participate thoroughly in health sector planning and decision making. Also at the national level, a variety of professional organizations sit on technical and policy committees of the Ministry of Health. There is also involvement of other non-governmental partners on an informal basis.

The Health Reform decentralization process has led to more success in involving civil society at the sub-national levels. For example, District and Hospital Boards are bodies that are specifically designed to include civil society representation. The vision is that the Boards make major decisions for those health facilities they cover: contract staff, set budget, etc. Constituting and empowering these Boards has been happening over time, but has not been fully implemented at this point.

Cambodia SWiM - Health: Most of the NGOs in the sector implement program activities in accordance with the MoH's sector strategy such as the implementation of the Minimum Package of Activities (MPA) at the Health Center level in consultation and with the concurrence of MoH. All USAID supported NGOs/CAs implement within the framework of the MoH's strategy to improve availability and access and increase utilization of essential health services at the community level.

Ethiopia Education Sector Development Program (ESDP): The GFDRE says it involves local community participation. However, in the SDP Program Implementation Manual, Chapter 6 (Community Participation) is a directive like discussion of how the community can physically support "their" local school or health center. That was 4 years ago. The government is currently developing a phase II for each of the social sector Sector Development Programs. Here they have explicitly placed a representative NGO on the Central Steering Committee, together with the Banks, representative bilateral donors, UN Group representation, and the EU, and chaired by the Minister of Health or Education, depending on the program.

Mali ESEP – Education. How it's supposed to work: civil society is represented in local stakeholders' bodies at the commune, circumscription and regional levels known as the Communal, Circumscription and Regional Advisory Commissions (Conseil Communal de Concertation, Conseil de Cercle de Concertation and Conseil Regional de Concertation). They are responsible for the implementation of education action planning and monitoring at all these different levels.

How it's working: at the present the Conseil de Concertations are not really operational in terms of action planning within the ESEP. . . . (I)n our new strategy USAID anticipates giving some capacity building support to assist them in carrying out this function.

Mozambique PROAGRI:

- Who: same group as for the design.
- How: (1) policy formulation – private sector groups are explicitly brought into the policy formulation process through various forums.
 - (2) planning – NGOs, producer associations, and individual farmers and companies are brought into ministry planning activities at the district and provincial levels.
 - (3) activity implementation – many ministry activities are implemented jointly with NGOs at the field level.
 - (4) outsourcing – government is starting to contract out various activities for NGOs to implement entirely.

Zambia ASIP: The ZNFU and the Program Against Malnutrition (PAM) were somewhat involved in implementation. The Seed Multiplication Component of ASIP was implemented mainly by civil society groups such as PAM. However, the perception of most stakeholders is that civil society involvement in the initial years of ASIP was minimal, and that the program was overwhelmingly public sector driven. Following the Mid Term Review (MTR) of ASIP in June 1998, it was resolved that Civil Society needed to be more involved in its implementation. Accordingly, the Agricultural Consultative Forum (ACF) was formed, supported financially by the Dutch Embassy, the Norwegian Embassy and USAID, to facilitate wider stakeholder involvement in policy regarding implementation of activities.

Bolivia SIBTA: The donor community, including USAID, has supported the development of this model by pooling and focusing their resources into the common channel of the SIBTA model and supporting the development of PITAs (Proyecto de Inovacion de Tecnologia Agricola). These projects have as their focus, assisting farmers to adopt appropriate agricultural technologies that will increase their income. These projects result from a competitive process whereby the community of agriculturally related organizations can submit ideas (profiles) that they think will significantly improve the functionality and profitability of some commodity chain. These profiles are evaluated in a transparent and competitive process whereby the most attractive are selected for funding. These selected profiles are developed into projects and put out for bid for appropriate companies to compete to win the execution of the project. The funding of the project comes from either the pooled resources of the donors or from specific funding from one of them. Critical to this process is the requirement that the beneficiaries - who generated the winning profile in the first place - are required to pay to the foundation a minimum of 15 percent of the value of the project.

Monitoring and Evaluation

As noted earlier, many of the SWApS are relatively new, and thus have not reached the M&E phase. The roles that appear to be emerging for civil society in M&E are advocacy, serving as information sources (based on organizations' operational role in implementation), independent assessors and reviewers of joint monitoring or evaluation reports. For USAID, civil society partners are often fully engaged in the M&E of USAID-financed activities within the larger frame of the SWAp.

Mali PRODESS:

- Groupe Pivot participates as a representative of civil society/NGOs in PRODESS ("donor") working group and PRODESS comité de suivi (monitoring)
- FENASCOM services as "deputy" of the PRODESS Monitoring Committee.

Pan Caribbean Partnership Against HIV/AIDS: Civil society groups have been involved in the development of annual work plans and in the specification of indicators for performance measurement.

Cambodia SWiM: For USAID supported activities, all our Partners were involved in the development of the Performance Monitoring Plan (PMP) and our Evaluation and Monitoring Adviser takes the lead role in the M&E activities. In addition to using the results for our USAID annual reporting purposes, MoH and other players in the sector are informed of our Partners performance periodically in different forum.

Ethiopia ESDP: There is a Joint Review Mission each year that is staged by the government and donors. This feeds into an Annual Review Meeting – typically about 3 days duration, at which the NGO community is invited to attend. The Joint Review Missions track specific key components, with a different focus each year. The Mission also compiles information on a series of indicators that were agreed to at the outset of the SDPs.

Mali ESEP: Six months after the official launch of ESEP, the first joint ESEP Monitoring Mission (Ministry of Education along with donors and Civil Society participants) occurred March 4-22, 2002. The progress made in the implementation of the ESEP is slow but moving in the right direction. Results are limited as it is just getting off the ground at the local, regional and national level. In terms of community involvement, local NGOs and parent association (APEs) were consulted during the M&E mission.

UGANDA Education: FENU has been at the table at the monthly meeting of the Education Funding Agencies Group.

Zambia ASIP: Initially civil society involvement in monitoring or evaluation was deemed weak but this was strengthened through the ACF creation in 1998.

Mozambique PROAGRI: Civil society is contacted at several points in the ministry's M&E system. Civil society also participates in the large formal review meetings held twice a year, though this participation is still somewhat limited.

The field data clearly show that there is room for civil society participation in SWApS and that civil society is taking on a number of different roles. The descriptions suggest that there are opportunities in each phase of a SWAp to encourage the involvement of civil society, and that there is flexibility in roles to adapt to differences among SWApS. We can already derive many of the capacity development requirements by studying these roles. However, since many SWApS are relatively recent, there is little definitive information regarding the quality of SWApS with and without civil society, or of the relative effectiveness of SWApS with and without. These will be useful variables to include in future M&E efforts.

Reasons for Including Civil Society in SWAps

Despite the fact that it is too soon to assess the impact of many SWAps, or civil society's participation in them, the questionnaire did ask respondents to offer their observations on the impacts of civil society on the SWAp to date. Three reasons for involving civil society can be hypothesized from these anecdotal observations:

- Involving civil society improves the accountability of both host government and donors at all phases of SWAps. This, in turn, enlarges the number of stakeholders in the SWAp and enhances the probability of successfully achieving the intended results of the SWAp.
- Civil society has a substantial share in the implementation of SWAps. Non-governmental organizations and private firms are major suppliers of services. Failure to recognize or include these operations within the frame of the SWAp begs the question of whether a SWAp is truly sector-wide.
- If civil society has an active – and preferably independent – role in monitoring and evaluation, accountability should be greatly strengthened. Such a role for civil society would also build a sustainable relationship between state and non-state actors in a country that would endure beyond the country's graduation from donor assistance. At present, this critical role remains underdeveloped.

The responses from the questionnaires that provide the foundation for these hypotheses are presented below.

Mali PRODESS: Groupe Pivot's advocacy resulted in certain recommendations being accepted in the PRODESS, e.g., increased role of NGOs in CS and FP; contractualization arrangements (e.g., the one district/one NGO for HIV activity mentioned above, may expand into immunizations, etc.), increased health care coverage; and a written guideline on NGO/MOH partnership (latter not particularly useful - yet? . . .).

Cambodia SWIM: Given the weak capacity of the public sector to meet the demands for basic health services at the community level, NGOs will continue to be an important partner of the public sector in the foreseeable future in Cambodia.

The participation of NGOs in the sector improved coverage, especially in under-served population and hard to reach remote areas of the country.

The Ministry has gained a better understanding of the NGOs role in the sector and how the NGOs participation lends itself with a cohesive mix of public-private partnership.

The on-going health sector reform and the long-term sector strategy development are the results of the active engagement of the NGOs in the sector.

Zambia Health: Another area in which civil society is directly involved in the SWAp is through Neighborhood Health Committees. These volunteer community groups are charged with working closely with their local health facility and its staff to oversee operations, work together to identify local health priorities, and have input into decisions on how to spend any income generated by health facility fees.

Pan Caribbean Partnership Against HIV/AIDS: Inclusion of the advocacy groups during the design resulted in a design that took account of the needs of people already infected, as well as of the prevention aspect.

Ethiopia ESDP: There has been little to no impact to date [of the] overall [SWAp]. However, in those communities where our own Community-Government Partnership program was active there was change. For example, you have girls support committees being established to be sure girls continue their schooling, to discourage "abduction for marriage", to establish teacher codes of ethics in specific schools. Now you see communities going to the local administration demanding their involvement when teachers are not performing, and requesting "their share" of the supplies to be provided through the local education offices.

Uganda Education: The involvement of FENU in the SWAp design resulted in non-formal education programs being recognized in policy, in the strategic plan, and in services provided by the NGOs.

Zambia ASIP: Following the mid term review that led to increased civil society involvement in ASIP implementation, priorities and targeting of development interventions became more stakeholder driven. Perceptions and attitude of the public sector towards the civil society improved in the direction of more engagement in a spirit of development partnership. On the other hand, civil society now sees more transparency and feels increased ownership of policy measures. In preparation of the follow-up program to ASIP, the Agricultural Commercial Program (ACP), many stakeholders feel there has been adequate collaboration with civil society.

Mozambique PROAGRI: The most significant result has been to broaden and strengthen the impact of the swap on the agricultural sector.

Bolivia SIBTA: The entire process ensures the participation of the government, the donor community, and the private sector in agricultural development. The structure of the system is a unique way to involve all three in a sector wide approach to agricultural development. The design process behind the development of project ensures broad-based participation of the civil society - or private sector - involved in agriculture. This civil society approach is open to the entire community to develop ideas that become projects. The requirement of the 15 percent

payment ensures the "buy-in" of the private sector to the process. The use of public funds ensures the attention and participation of the Government of Bolivia. The commitment of the donor community provides a focused system whereby donor resources work together toward common goals.

. . . There are now seven PITAs in execution, and others in development. In addition, other non-PITA-funded interventions are underway, including SIMA (Servicio Informativo de Mercados Agropecuarios) that is now broadcasting, nation-wide, agricultural prices, by radio, on a daily basis.

Issues in Civil Society Involvement in SWApS

The question guide included an open-ended inquiry as to whether USAID support for civil society participation had been an issue for either the host government or the other donor partners. Two principal, interlinked, issues emerged from the field responses.

- Over half of the respondents indicated that the host governments interpreted a SWAp to mean that all funds should accrue to government, and all implementation responsibility should rest with government. This led to instances in which civil society was ignored, or, worse, actively discouraged from involvement. Most of those responses added, however, that the host government has changed its position toward civil society and is now including it.
- "Basket funding" denotes to host government and many of the donor partners that civil society activities, if they exist in the sector, are outside of the frame of the SWAp. In two instances, respondents indicated that "basket funding" either does not include civil society activity, or has caused the level of civil society activity in the sector to diminish. Although the reasons for this would have to be explored more carefully, on its face, it would appear that if the "basket" is within the government budget, by definition, non-state actors would be excluded from direct funding by external partners, and would be dependent upon host government's provision of a "window" for non-state actors.

The principle stated in the Overseas Development Institute's paper on "The Choice of Financial Instruments"² that "Government would define its own role in relation to the private and not for profit sectors, and, if there is a case for subsidising an activity carried out via these non-Government routes, the resources could be financed via the budget," must be nuanced in two ways. First, it is not clear whether the last phrase means registration in the budget, even if privately or donor

² Foster, Mick and Jennifer Leavy, Working Paper 158, London: ODI, October 2001, p. 5.

financed, or disbursed by government from its revenues. Second the principle may rest on sound economic reasoning, but an analysis of the political economy would suggest that private and not-for-profit actors that receive funds disbursed by government are unlikely to be able to play the role of Lavergne's "local constituencies"³ with objectivity. USAID's experience confirms that some non-state actors are ideologically opposed to receiving money from the state for fear of co-optation. So, USAID does not envision an eventual situation in which all funds flow to the state budget for disbursement to private actors.

For some host governments and partners, there is a view that all services should be provided by the state, and therefore, all funds must be within the government budget. This is likely to have a negative impact on both quantity and quality of service delivery in some core sectors. There appears to be some variation among the sectors on this point, with the agricultural sector SWAps being more open to the inclusion of both private enterprise and non-profit NGOs as full partners in SWAps. This would have to be verified in further review, however.

Some of the field comments on these issues include:

Ghana Health: The 'common basket' does not fund civil society organizations. These are funded separately by other donors, often following the commonly set priorities from the plan of work of the MoH and partners.

Civil society hardly participates in the SWAp discussions. Although dentists and nurses professional organizations etc. are represented, they are hardly visible (audible) in the discussions. The MOH plan of work does not really integrate civil society.

MoH would have a preference for channeling all funds through the common basket, but allows donors to fund civil society directly.

Since recently, all donors are required to report all their health sector expenditure to the MoH, to get a realistic picture of what is funded in the entire health sector.

Ethiopia Health Sector Development Program (HSDP): The first phase of HSDP is completed in this year and NGOs were not included. There is an attempt to consider the NGOs' activities in the Second Phase of HSDP. In the Second Phase of HSDP, which is under process, the NGOs are represented in the Central Joint Steering Committee (CSJC) for the HSDP through their umbrella organization called CRDA. The CJSC is the highest governance body for the HSDP.

³ Lavergne, Real, "Results-Based Management and Accountability for Enhanced Aid Effectiveness." Ottawa:CIDA, May 2002, p. 13.

The host government wants all financial resources for the SWAp to flow through the government budget. However, the majority of the donors that support the HSDP do not channel their resources through the government budget. . . .Some partners do not yet consider the activities of the civil society as part of the HSDP. However, the role of the NGOs is increasing and getting recognition.

- a) Mali PRODESS: Yes - neither the GRM/MOH nor other donors want to see civil society doing direct implementation, rather to assume a facilitative role (USAID/Mali agrees)
- b) No, MOH doesn't necessarily expect all financial resources for the SWAp to flow through the govt. budget, at least not at the highest level. But GRM mechanisms do not adapt -- have not yet adapted to taking into account other-than-flow-through government budget support.
- c) No, all think civil society has a very important role to play. Environment here is at least at the moment very favorable for increasing civil society participation.

Zambia Health Many officials in the Ministry of Health tend to view the SWAp as synonymous with pooled funding arrangements. USAID does contribute a relatively small portion of our overall funding for the sector to a common "basket" which supports health services at the district level and below. However, a number of other donors, notably the northern European countries, are increasingly putting the bulk of their contributions through the basket. There is significant pressure on USAID to move away from "projects" and towards "a full SWAp", e.g. full participation in basket funding". That being said, other donors do also fund NGOs and other activities outside the government sector, but in an increasingly limited way.

Ethiopia ESDP: The GFDRE would prefer all funding to flow through the treasury. However, their systems, while robust, are not timely enough or capable of tracking specific funds. Also, the government is currently in the throes of a major overhaul of their planning, budgeting, and accounting systems (with USAID help via Harvard University). This will enable the government to proceed with their plans to provide block grants down to the district level (comprehensive grants including recurrent and capitol budgets) where priority decisions for funding will be made. There is significant movement recently by the government to involve local community participation, although it is not clear whether this means simply taxing communities through in-kind support for education, health, etc. the government has however, requested that USAID conduct a thorough evaluation of our Community School-Grants Program, to glean recommendations to better involve communities in the running of their schools.

Mali ESEP: USAID Mali support for civil society through monies channeled to American PVOs has been an issue for the Ministry of Education. The Ministry of Education would prefer USAID financial assistance to go directly to the Ministry and its deconcentrated structures (Regional Education Offices). Recently there has been a better understanding on the part of the ministry as to why USAID is providing funds to PVOs to implement actions that are within the scope of ESEP and are complimentary to actions planned/taken by the ministry.

Among some donor partners there has been the question of whether financing through our PVO partners should be considered as part of SWAp financing, though the government sides with USAID on this.

Zambia ASIP: Initially, the host government wanted all the resources channeled through its budget (Basket Funding). However, following resistance to this mode of funding by the majority of bilateral donors, including USAID, government now accepts support to various areas of the agricultural sector through direct arrangements with civil society.

Mozambique PROAGRI: Both government and other donors appreciate the different and complementary roles played by civil society and government. The partnership between government, donors and the civil society was somewhat weak at first (preached by not practiced), but it seems to be steadily strengthening.

Conclusion

Civil society involvement enriches SWAps and has the potential to significantly improve accountability and the successful achievement of results. Based on the information provided by USAID's field mission personnel directing programs that are included in country SWAps, models are emerging for civil society participation. These models can be adapted to the particulars of each SWAp. They include roles at design, implementation and M&E phases of SWAps.

The specific sector of the SWAp may influence some of the partners' receptivity to civil society involvement, but all sectors appear to have the potential for inclusion of civil society. Further work must be done to assess the promise of civil society to increase accountability and effectiveness of SWAps. However, civil society needs support in order to participate in SWAps. Without support to develop necessary capacities, and to defray the costs of participation, civil society pays what Charles Okeahalam referred to as an imputed tax.⁴ Civil society is weakened as a partner in this circumstance. So, it is not enough to define ownership as including all actors. All actors must be supported – USAID says directly - to participate in program-based approaches.

Partners should carefully review expectations of the role of state and non-state actors, and how those expectations may be influenced by the use of the "basket" funding mechanism. USAID would be interested in collaborating with other partners in a more in-depth and systematic review at country level of the question of civil society inclusion in program-based approaches.

⁴ Okeahalam, Charles. "Institutional Capacity and Public Financial Management in East and Southern Africa." Presented at the CIDA-sponsored Forum on Accountability and Risk Management under Program-Based Approaches, Ottawa, June 19-21, 2002.

Countries with Sector-Wide Approaches
in which USAID Participates

Health

Bangladesh
Cambodia
Caribbean Regional
Ethiopia
Ghana
Mali
Mozambique
Nicaragua
Senegal
Tanzania
Uganda
Zambia

Education

Ethiopia
Mali
Senegal
Uganda

Agriculture

Bolivia
Malawi
Mozambique
Zambia

Question Guide
Civil Society in SWAp

Definitions:

Civil society – all non-state actors, whether groups or individuals, for- or non-profit.

SWAp (sector-wide approach) is a strategy in which all significant funding for the sector supports a single sector policy and expenditure program, under government leadership, adopting common approaches across the sector. A SWAp is SOMETIMES funded with budget support, but that is not the defining variable. SWAp are often funded by individual donor mechanisms and host country revenues using separate instruments within a common framework.

QUESTIONS:

1. What is the name/title used in the country for the SWAp?
2. Were civil society organizations/individuals involved in SWAp

Design? Yes___ No___ Who were they and how were they involved (if yes)?

Implementation? Y_____ N_____ Who were they and how were they involved (if yes)?

Monitoring and evaluating progress and results? Y_____ N_____ Who were they and how were they involved (if yes)?

3. Did USAID support civil society participation in the SWAp? How? (e.g., through existing pre-positioned financial support, through new grant or other mechanism, through TA or training, or through support to the host government to finance the participation of civil society, or TA to the government to effectively work with civil society, or by direct consultation between civil society and donors to the SWAp).
4. What, if any, was the impact (or is the anticipated impact) of civil society participation in the SWAp? (e.g. did the priorities or focus change; is there better coverage? is there more support for necessary reform measures than would otherwise be the case?)

5. Is USAID support for civil society participation an issue for either the host government or the other donor partners? For example, does the host government expect all financial resources for the SWAp to flow through the government budget? Do other donor partners discount implementation of some of the program by civil society as an actual part of the SWAp?



U.S. Agency for International Development

Sector-wide Approaches and Civil Society

Joan S. Atherton

Analytical Framework

- Three general phases for civil society participation in SWAps:
 - design
 - implementation
 - monitoring and evaluation (M&E)



U.S. Agency for International Development

Countries with Sector-Wide Approaches in which USAID Participates

Health

- Bangladesh
- Cambodia
- Caribbean Regional
- Ethiopia
- Ghana
- Mali
- Mozambique
- Nicaragua
- Senegal
- Tanzania
- Uganda
- Zambia

Education

- Ethiopia
- Mali
- Senegal
- Uganda

Agriculture

- Bolivia
- Malawi
- Mozambique
- Zambia



U.S. Agency for International Development

Design

“Groupe Pivot's advocacy resulted in certain recommendations being accepted, e.g., increased role of NGOs in Child Survival and Family Planning; increased health care coverage; and a written guideline on NGO/MoH partnership.”

- USAID/Mali on PRODESS



U.S. Agency for International Development

Implementation

“The participation of NGOs in the sector improved coverage, especially in under-served population and hard to reach remote areas of the country. The Ministry has gained a better understanding of the NGOs role in the sector and how the NGOs participation lends itself with a cohesive mix of public-private partnership.”

“The on-going health sector reform and the long-term sector strategy development are the results of the active engagement of the NGOs in the sector.”

- USAID/Cambodia on SWiM



U.S. Agency for International Development

Monitoring and Evaluation

“Following the mid-term review that led to increased civil society involvement in ASIP implementation, priorities and targeting of development interventions became more stakeholder driven. Perceptions and attitudes of the public sector towards civil society improved in the direction of more engagement in a spirit of development partnership. In addition, civil society now sees more transparency and feels increased ownership of policy measures.”

- USAID/Zambia on ASIP



U.S. Agency for International Development

Why Involve Civil Society?

- ❑ Improves the accountability of both host government and donors in all phases of SWAp.
- ❑ Civil society is a major implementor of SWAps.
- ❑ If civil society has an active role in monitoring and evaluation, accountability should be greatly strengthened.



U.S. Agency for International Development

Issues

- ❑ Host governments interpreted a SWAp to mean that all funds should accrue to government, and all implementation responsibility should rest with government.
- ❑ “Basket funding” denotes to host government and many of the donor partners that civil society activities, if they exist in the sector, are outside of the frame of the SWAp.



U.S. Agency for International Development
